DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 538 CS 215 539

AUTHOR Marra, James L.; And Others
TITLE Student Advertising Competitions: Faculty Advisor Beliefs Concerning the AAF National Student Advertising Competition.
PUB DATE Aug 96
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (79th, Anaheim, CA, August 10-13, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advertising; Career Development; *Faculty Advisers; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Rewards; *Student Development; Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Advertising Competitions; *Advertising Education; Adviser Role; American Advertising Federation; Faculty Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study examined American Advertising Federation (AAF) National Student Advertising Competition (NSAC) team faculty advisor beliefs regarding the value of the competition for themselves and students. The value for the advisors is assessed according to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, career goals, and tenure, promotion, and/or merit prospects. The value for students is assessed according to the educational, experiential, and career-orientation benefits afforded students who participate in the competition. A survey of 121 faculty advisors from all AAF districts contained 15 statements with responses to those statements arranged on a continuum interval scale from "strongly disagree to strongly agree," plus 4 open-ended questions regarding issues of, for instance, benefits and drawbacks for student competition. Results indicated that advisors believe an equitable extrinsic reward structure does not exist for them and suggest faculty advisor dissatisfaction or skepticism regarding extrinsic rewards attached to career advancement. Findings also suggest the strength of intrinsic rewards for both students and advisors. (Contains 5 tables of data and 12 references.) (Author/CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 401 538

Student Advertising Competitions:

Faculty Advisor Beliefs Concerning the AAF National Student Advertising Competition

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

James L. Marra
Department of Journalism
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA 19122

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J Marra
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Jim Avery
Department of Journalism and Public Communications
University of Alaska Anchorage
Anchorage, AK 99508

Maria Elizabeth Grabe
School of Journalism
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

Submitted for consideration as part of the Advertising Division Professional Freedom & Responsibility paper presentations, AEJMC, August, 1996

CS 215 539

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student Advertising Competitions: Faculty Advisor Beliefs Concerning the AAF National Student Advertising Competition

Abstract

This study seeks to explore AAF NSAC competition team faculty advisor beliefs regarding the value of the competition for themselves and students. The value for themselves is assessed according to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, career goals, and tenure, promotion, and/or merit prospects. The value for students is assessed according to the educational, experiential, and career-orientation benefits afforded students who participate in the competition. A survey of 131 faculty advisors was completed in the late fall of 1993 and early winter of 1994. Faculty advisors from all AAF districts participated in the survey. This paper presents the survey results, with emphasis on the challenge to career advancement for those acting as advisors to AAF NSAC teams.

Student Advertising Competitions: Faculty Advisor Beliefs Concerning the AAF National Student Advertising Competition

Introduction

The American Advertising Federation (AAF) annually sponsors one of the most prominent student advertising competitions in advertising education. Known as the AAF's National Student Advertising Competition (NSAC), the competition involves a large number of students and faculty from colleges and universities around the country. As those with experience in the competition know, leading corporations and advertisers such as the Saturn Corporation, American Airlines, the Coca-Cola Company, and Levi Strauss and Company typically act as sponsors for the competition. Each year a new corporation sponsors the competition.

The estimates of student involvement in the competition suggest the AAF competition's importance to advertising higher education, with that involvement reflected in the growth of AAF chapters on campuses nationwide. In 1990, for example, there were 175 student chapters. By 1993 there were more than 200 chapters. The scant literature relating to the competition also points to increasing student involvement. For instance, as advisor to the national winning team in the 1991 competition with American Airlines as the sponsor, Henton notes that there were "more than 200 national entries prepared by more than 6000 students." (1991). In the late 1980s the numbers were still impressive, though not as large. In an anonymous article from *Marketing News* , the estimate for the 1988 competition included 2500 students from 122 colleges and universities across the country (1988). A year earlier Lauterborn claimed that there were 4400 students from 155 campus chapters involved in the competition (1987).

The scope and breadth of numbers of students involved in the competition means that anywhere from 10% to 30% of all students studying advertising in the United States are actively involved in the AAF competition (Ross 1990). For those who are not, however, the extensive publicity and discussion surrounding

the competition manage to give it an indirect, though real regional and national importance, reflecting for the most part the timely and topical nature of the competition to students, faculty and the professional community at large.

Not only does the AAF competition impact on students, it also impacts on the faculty who serve as advisors for the student teams. Given that there are approximately 400 full-time faculty teaching in accredited advertising programs across the nation (Ross 1990), the approximation of 200 student teams suggests that there are at least 200 faculty members advising those teams. Indeed, the number may easily be larger, since some teams are advised by more than one faculty member. In any event, as wide as this range of faculty involvement may be, it still reflects the influence the competition exerts on faculty work lives, especially given the very real prospect that faculty advisors devote considerable and even extraordinary time and effort to the competition.

Given this significance of the AAF competition to students, faculty and advertising education generally, it is surprising that scant research attention has been paid to the competition or to those involved as advisors or participants. Addressing this problem, the goal of this study is to investigate the beliefs that faculty AAF team advisors hold about the competition. More specifically, this study endeavors to analyze advisor beliefs along two dimensions. First are the extrinsic rewards of the competition for advisors. Second are the advisors' evaluations of the extrinsic rewards of the competition for participating students. Faculty viewpoints on the relative worth and benefit of advising an AAF team are assessed according to advising's impact on student-centered and faculty work-related issues.

Previous Research

As previously noted, scant research attention has been paid to the AAF competition. Since 1986 there have been no articles focusing on the competition published in *Journalism Educator*, *Journalism Quarterly*, or the *Journal of Advertising*. In addition, since 1986 only two papers focusing on the competition (Marra and Avery, 1992; Marra, Avery and Rao, 1993) have been presented at the national conventions for the American Academy of Advertising

(AAA) or the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (AEJMC). Those papers focused on student perspectives and attitudes toward involvement in the competition and did not at all focus on faculty perspectives and attitudes. Yet, a recent, lively, and extended discussion by advertising faculty on the AdForum internet bulletin board centered vigorously on the competition, suggesting considerable interest in the topic among advertising faculty.

Despite the overall dearth of research on the competition, however, there has been considerable attention paid to a variety of topics tangential to faculty involvement in the competition. For example, Schweitzer investigated research expectations placed on faculty at undergraduate-only and graduate schools (1988, 1989). Plumley Jr. also investigated factors influencing evaluation of non-traditional faculty, presumably those with more professional than academic experience and thus those perhaps more willing and able to meet the varied and rigorous demands inherent to advising an AAF competition team (1990). Though Plumley Jr.'s study reflects the sympathies of administrators toward establishing less regimented and less traditional guidelines in the evaluations of non-traditional faculty, such guidelines have not become the order of the day.

How such studies overall relate to faculty involvement in the competition can be seen in Schweitzer's conclusion that research productivity depends on a "research culture" within the school or department and the "stimulation and encouragement of colleagues in your department." In terms of leading to research productivity, these two factors were second and third only to "personal motivation" as influences in becoming an active and productive researcher. The bearing this has on faculty involvement in the competition relates to the amount of time and effort a faculty member is likely to spend on the competition, no doubt time and effort that could be used for research productivity.

Of course, research productivity is more important to some faculty than others. Yet, research on the matter has shown that there is a direct correlation between that productivity and a faculty member's chances of obtaining tenure or promotion (Schweitzer 1989). In a survey of 92 AEJMC school administrators, Schweitzer concluded the following:

> This survey of administrators suggests that those faculty who prefer teaching to research and who hope to get past tenure and promotion committees based on "continuing professional achievement" may be in danger of being passed over for tenure and promotion if they do not already hold that status. (p. 45)

As Schweitzer's study seems to suggest, if a faculty member spends considerable time and effort advising a competition team, then that faculty member's career and the ability to continue advising a team in the future are endangered. Consequently, such a prospective reality would seem to be more relevant to junior faculty than senior faculty. Indeed, Schweitzer claims that junior faculty are particularly vulnerable in this respect, simply because, "they ignore research and publication at their peril." At the same time, it is precisely the junior faculty who often advise AAF competition teams, and as implied in the findings of Schweitzer's study, it is junior faculty who can least afford to do so.

In the most exhaustive study on journalism and mass communications educators in the past decade, Weaver and Wilhoit note that for young faculty, "teaching gets the slight nod over research" when it comes to faculty satisfaction with their work. When it comes to faculty dissatisfaction, "inadequate compensation and oppressive workloads" dominate (1988). Those who have advised an AAF competition team know that usually there is little or no compensation, and the workload is extraordinary. At the same time, however, Weaver and Wilhoit are quick to note that the "overwhelming fulfillment of academic life for mass communications faculty is working with students." Since AAF team faculty advisors work so closely with students, the intrinsic rewards in this regard may be exceptional.

Still other tangential research is more qualitative than quantitative and does have bearing on the matter of faculty involvement in the competition. For example, in 1989 *Journalism Educator* published "A Report of the Task Force on the Future of Journalism and Mass Communications Education." (1989). In this report, the task force claims that "educators constantly grapple with the question of balance between the theoretical and the applied components of formal

education." Indeed, the writings of scholars such as Blanchard weigh heavily against specialized education in favor of a more liberal and holistic education (1988). Blanchard refers to the components of specialized education as "artificial subspecialties," and claims that they tend to fragment, not integrate the learning process. Presumably, highly specialized education would refer to learning experiences such as the AAF competition.

Though more focused on the actual learning environment and students, the arguments of Blanchard and others do have bearing on faculty involvement in competitions such as AAF's NSAC. The arguments prompt interesting and perhaps disturbing questions pertaining to faculty. For instance, are faculty advisors contributing to the fragmented learning of students? Are they fostering a specialized education which overwhelms a more liberal education? And regarding themselves, are faculty advisors restricting their own learning, consequently developing their own narrow biases, while capitulating to a professional community that offers little reward or recognition for their time and efforts?

Overall, when it comes to the AAF competition, the research has been scant, particularly in terms of the competition as a vigorous part of the educational process. However, in terms of tangential matters such as how faculty should spend their work time, or the comparative needs for theory-based or practice-based education, the research is more extensive. Based on the Schweitzer studies, it seems clear that research productivity is still prized, at least among administrators of journalism and mass communications schools or departments. More so, it seems clear that activities such as advising an AAF competition may conflict with one's career goals, assuming that those goals are oriented toward tenure and promotion. At the same time, undergraduate-only programs or programs which have done more than pay lip service to the tenure and promotion needs of non-traditional faculty seem to offer the best opportunity for rewarding and recognizing competition advisorships (Plumley Jr, 1990; Schweitzer, 1989).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research Questions

Based on the authors' knowledge of the AAF competition and the review of direct and tangential literature on the subject as it pertains to faculty, the following research questions directed this study:

1. Do faculty advisors believe the AAF competition is a valuable learning, experiential and career-oriented activity for students?
2. Do faculty advisors believe their efforts as advisors are rewarded or recognized adequately by colleagues?
3. Do faculty advisors believe their efforts as advisors have helped or hindered their career goals, particularly in respect to the prospects for gaining tenure, promotion and/or merit?

Method

During the late fall of 1993 and winter of 1994, and prior to the AAF NSAC district competitions, survey questionnaires were sent to all AAF team advisors across the nation. There were a total of 200 questionnaires mailed, representing a near totality of the universe of active AAF advisors. A total of 130 questionnaires (or 65 percent) were returned, of which nine were not used in data analysis. These nine questionnaires were excluded because the responding advisors had not completed their first attempt at advising the competition and therefore could not answer questions pertaining to experience in this position. A total of 121 questionnaires are used in this study. Missing cases were deleted pairwise and produced numbers of cases for each variable ranging from 117 to 121 (see Table 3). The questionnaire contained fifteen statements with responses to those statements arranged on a continuum interval scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The questionnaire also contained four open-ended questions asking the faculty to respond to issues of benefits and drawbacks of the competition for students, why students become advertising majors, what AAF or faculty departments, schools, etc. could do to help the advisor, and the experience of the advisor.

Results

Frequencies are presented as general descriptions of the advisors' demographic profiles. Correlation between all variables will be used to indicate general patterns of association.

Table 1 reflects general demographic information about the advisors. It is clear that the majority of advisors (33.3 percent) have interest and/or experience in a combination of creative, account, media, and research advertising areas. It is also noteworthy that 70.6 percent of advisors are male while 29.4 percent are female. The majority of advisors are assistant professors. Their average age is 47, with 11 years of teaching experience. The average number of years advising the competition is four and one-half. It is also clear that there is a less than one mean for winning on the district level and placement on the national level.

The frequencies, as percentages of total responses, are presented in Table 2. This table gives an indication of the advisor responses to the 5-point interval scale. Strong agreement accumulated (73.6 percent) on the idea that the competition is a valuable learning experience for students. Strong disagreement is most visible (45.3 percent) on the idea that advising the competition will help advisors to obtain tenure, promotion or merit.

Table 3 gives an indication of where the average scores on each variable lie. Focusing on the means of 3 and above, it is clear the advisors believed the competition is a valuable educational experience for students. Considering means of below 3, it is evident that advisors did not believe the competition provides recognition for their efforts or that advising this competition will lead to promotion in their careers.

The correlation matrix (Table 4) reveals strong correlation (of .5 and above) between variables on two dimensions. First, on the matter of whether students benefit from the competition, it is obvious that variables pertaining to the value of the competition as an educational experience and career preparation are highly correlated. Second, the impact of the competition on advisors' careers is

reflected in high correlations between variables relating to career fulfillment, extrinsic rewards, and appreciation/recognition for advising efforts.

Correlation coefficients (Table 5) reveal strong significance in the advisor beliefs about time consumption in advising a team and, in general, the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for both students and advisors participating in the competition.

Interpretation

The interpretation of survey results suggests pointed answers to the research questions driving this study. Those questions are addressed in order below.

1. *Do faculty advisors believe the AAF competition is a valuable learning, experiential and career-oriented activity for students?*

Clearly, the advisors believed in the educational and experiential values of the AAF NSAC competition for students. For example, from Table 2 (percentages), 73.6 percent strongly agreed with the statement that the competition was a valuable learning experience for students. Additionally, advisors believed the competition experience teaches students more about advertising than most classes (45.5 percent strongly agreed). As seen in Table 3 (means/std. dev.), the means on variables related to the educational and experiential values of the competition to students also reflect this strong advisor viewpoint. For example, there was strong advisor belief in terms of how well the competition experience provides intrinsic rewards for students. Similarly, there was relatively strong advisor belief in the competition as exemplary of what higher education should be.

When the strength of the advisor beliefs are assessed according to the career-orientation value of the competition to students, a similar interpretation can be made. For example, as noted in both Tables 2 and 3, the advisors tended to strongly believe in the prospects for job opportunities for students, though they did acknowledge a distinction between winning students being placed in positions to receive good versus exceptional job offers.

The matter of extrinsic rewards for students, those that are tangible, relatively immediate and dependent on their involvement in the competition, is to be carefully distinguished from the matters of both intrinsic rewards and job opportunities. For instance, there was far less strong agreement by advisors on whether students received adequate extrinsic rewards versus either intrinsic rewards or the prospects for good job opportunties.

Overall, advisors very much valued the competition for both its educational and experiential value to students. They also valued how winning students can be placed in a position of job opportunity. However, the advisors were more reluctant to commit themselves to strong, positive beliefs in the extrinsic rewards the competition provides students.

2. *Do faculty advisors believe their efforts as advisors are rewarded or recognized adequately by colleagues?*

As much as there was strong, positive advisor belief in the educational, experiential and career-oriented value of the competition for students, there was also a lack of such belief in the perceived rewards or recognition for advisors from their colleagues. For example, in Table 2, 50.4 percent (23.1 percent for strongly disagree and 27.3 percent for disagree) believed their journalism faculty colleagues did not appreciate their efforts as team advisors. When assessing their advertising faculty colleagues' appreciation, however, the advisors were less staunch, with 37.6 percent (20.5 percent strongly disagree and 17.1 percent disagree) believing those colleagues did not appreciate their efforts as advisors.

A similar situation of belief on the negative side arises when you consider that 56.2 percent of advisors did not believe their respective schools provided adequate recognition for their roles as advisors. Interestingly as well, when compared with advisor beliefs about the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards the competition provides for students, the advisor beliefs about the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards the competition provides for them were negative. Also, as with the difference of belief between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for students, the same difference exists for belief between those rewards for the advisors. In

effect, the advisors believed, though less vigorously, that there were more intrinsic than extrinsic rewards to be had in advising the competition team.

Overall, advisors believed their efforts were not recognized adequately by their respective schools and by either their journalism or advertising faculty colleagues. They also believed there were less rewards (intrinsic and extrinsic) for themselves than for students, and they believed the intrinsic rewards were more available than the extrinsic rewards.

3. *Do faculty advisors believe their efforts as advisors have helped or hindered their career goals, particularly in respect to the prospects for gaining tenure, promotion and/or merit?*

As can be seen in all tables, the advisor beliefs about whether their competition advising efforts will help with tenure, promotion and/or merit were strongly negative. For example, in response to the statement, "Advising efforts will help tenure, promotion and/or merit," 45.3 percent strongly disagreed and 23.9 percent disagreed. Collapsed together, the percentage for those disagreeing with that statement was 69.2, with the mean of 1.97436 reflecting the vigor of this belief. At the same time, the strength of the belief is softened when the advisors considered whether the competition would help fulfill career goals. Only 38.0 percent strongly disagreed and disagreed versus 69.2 percent on the tenure, promotion and/or merit issue, perhaps suggesting different career goals than those routinely judged as important by the academy at large. Still, however, the negative aspect of this belief that advising the competition team does not contribute to fulfillment of career goals does exist, since more advisors disagreed than agreed that it did.

Overall, the advisors clearly believed that advising the competition does not help with tenure, promotion and/or merit rewards and recognitions, nor does it help with fulfilling career goals, though not as dramatically.

Gender Interpretations from Results

A number of noteworthy negative correlation coefficients involve the gender of advisors (see Table 5). First, the gender of advisors is significantly (<.05) and negatively correlated to the title of advisors. The indication is that male advisors predominate in higher academic ranks. Second, gender and the competition's extrinsic rewards for students are also negatively and significantly (<.05) correlated. This means that male advisors saw the competition as significantly more rewarding to students than female advisors did. Female advisors evaluated the competition as significantly (<.05) less rewarding for themselves than male advisors. Finally, the gender and age of advisors are negatively (<.01) correlated. This reflects a high concentration of older male advisors.

Discussion

In relating results back to concerns about faculty advisor career incentives for advising an AAF NSAC competition team, it seems clear that, in keeping with Schweitzer's studies, junior faculty, presumably though not necessarily all those at the assistant professor level, are most affected by the demands of time and effort attributed to the team advising responsibility. As noted in Table 1, the majority of advisors are assistant professors, though many of them are older males, perhaps reflecting numbers of relatively new faculty into the academy from the professional community. In any event, and as Schweitzer argues, time and effort commitment to advisorship duties may well endanger the possibilities for career advancement, particularly if research productivity is as vital to career advancement as Schweitzer suggests.

Additionally, strong advisor disagreement to the idea that advising the competition team will help career advancement (Tables 2 and 3) may be reflective of the Weaver and Wilhoit finding that inadequate compensation is tied to faculty dissatisfaction. Similarity, too, can be found in the link between advisor beliefs in the competition as a valuable educational experience for students and Weaver and Wilhoit's conclusion that working with students helps

create "overwhelming fulfillment" for faculty. Here, it is possible that faculty advisors experience the positive effect of intrinsic rewards through their close ties to students, while simultaneously remaining skeptical or fearful of how the expenditure of time and effort will help them financially or in respect to career advancement.

It is with such extrinsic rewards as monetary gain or career advancement for faculty advisors that this study begins to address the pragmatic concerns of faculty dedication to the task of advising an AAF NSAC competition team. It seems possible that advisors link their team's performance to their own career advancement. Similarly, student performance at the competition level may contribute to the advisors' beliefs about the extrinsic rewards for themselves. Despite their dedication to competition team students, advisors are also genuinely concerned for their own welfare in very pragmatic terms. The implication is that faculty advisors have not experienced extrinsic rewards for their time and effort, and that they may perceive the possibility of those rewards as tied to team performance. With focus on personal career advancement, advisors may assess the value and worth of the competition for both students and themselves from a distinctly career-oriented viewpoint, perhaps reflecting the intensity of their concerns in this respect.

Conclusion

Given the importance of the AAF's National Advertising Student Competition to advertising education and to the lives of advertising students and faculty, it is valuable to assess and evaluate the beliefs of those involved in the competition. To date the research has been scant, with limited concentration on student beliefs. To date, also, the research has been nonexistent in respect to faculty advisor beliefs regarding the competition. This study sheds light on those faculty advisor beliefs.

This study cuts across AAF regional districts, school size, team success, and faculty advisor demographic profiles. Most notably as they relate to the research questions guiding the study, the results suggest faculty advisor dissatisfaction or

skepticism regarding extrinsic rewards attached to career advancement. This carries over as well to the general esteem afforded advisors from colleagues in the academy. The results also suggest the strength of intrinsic rewards for both students and advisors.

The implications from this study seem to direct themselves to university, AAF, and corporate sponsor administrators. No doubt, AAF teams need faculty advisors. Yet, this study suggests that those advisors believe an equitable extrinsic reward structure does not exist. The question becomes, What can the university, AAF, and/or the corporate sponsors do to reward those advisors, particularly regarding the prospects for career advancement, if in fact all three parties believe in the value and worth of the AAF competition and the conscientious efforts of faculty advisors who contribute to the competition's success?

References

Anonymous, "Kellogg to Sponsor AAF Student Ad Contest," *Marketing News*, (July 18, 1988), 22, 32.

AEJMC (1989), "Challenges & Opportunities in Journalism & Mass Communications: A Report of the Task Force on the Future of Journalism and Mass communication Education," *Journalism Educator*, 44 (Spring, 1989), A - 1 - A - 24.

Blanchard, Robert O. (1988), "Our Emerging Role in Liberal and Media Studies," *Journalism Educator*, 43 (Autumn, 1988), 28 - 31.

Henton, Cheryl. (1991). "Media Planning 101," *Inside Media*, (October 9, 1991), 62 - 63.

Lauterborn, Bob. (1987). "Advertising's College Bowl," *Advertising Age*, 58 (September 28, 1987), 18.

Marra, James L. and James R. Avery. (1992). "Student Advertising Competitions: Student Perspectives on the AAF Competition," *AEJMC Convention*, (Montreal, August, 1992).

Marra, James L., James R. Avery and Aruna Rao. (1993). "Student Advertising Competitions: Student Perspectives on the AAF Competition, Part II," *AEJMC Convention* (Kansas City, August, 1993).

Plumley, Joseph P. (1990). "Key for Evaluating 'Non-Traditional Faculty," *Journalism Educator*, 43 (Autumn, 1990), 46 - 53.

Ross, Billy I. (1990). *Advertising Education*, (Lubbock, TX: Advertising Education Publications, 1990), p. 73.

Schweitzer, John C. (1989). "Factors Affecting Scholarly Research Among Mass Communications Faculty," *Journalism Quarterly*, 66 (Summer, 1989), 410 - 417.

---------- (1989). "Faculty Research Expectation Varies Among Universities," *Journalism Educator*, 44 (Summer, 1989), 45 - 49.

Weaver, David and G. Cleveland Wilhoit. (1988). "A Profile of JMC Educators: Traits, Attitudes and Values," *Journalism Educator*, 43 (Summer, 1988), 4 - 41.

TABLE 1

Demographic information

ADVERTISING CONCENTRATION AND EXPERIENCE
MODE = COMBINATION

AREAS:	***PERCENTAGE***
CREATIVE	19.2
ACCOUNT	16.7
MEDIA	8.3
RESEARCH	9.2
COMBINATION	33.3
NONE	10.8
OTHER	2.5

GENDER:
Mode = MALE

MALE	70.6
FEMALE	29.4

TITLE:
Mode = ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

DIRECTOR/CHAIR	5.9
PROFESSOR	14.4
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	31.4
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	26.3
LECTURER/TEACHER/INSTRUCTOR	5.3
ADJUNCT PROFESSOR	1.7
ADVERTISING PROFESSIONAL	4.2

	MEAN
AGE	46.800
YEARS TEACHING	11.042
YEARS ADVISING NSAC	4.597
NUMBER OF TIMES WON DISTRICT	0.706
NUMBER OF TIMES PLACED NATIONAL	0.202

TABLE 2

Advisor beliefs about AAF NSAC competition

	PERCENTAGE FROM STRONGLY DISAGREE TO STRONGLY AGREE				
	SD	*D*	*N*	*A*	*SA*
VALUABLE LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENTS	1.7	0.00	4.1	20.7	73.6
TEACHES MORE ABOUT HOW ADVERTISING WORKS THAN MOST CLASSES	1.7	3.3	22.3	27.3	45.5
WINNING PLACES STUDENTS IN A POSITION TO RECEIVE JOB OFFERS	4.1	9.9	28.9	30.6	26.4
WINNING PLACES STUDENTS IN A POSITION TO RECEIVE EXCEPTIONAL JOB OFFERS	0	13.3	42.5	26.7	12.5
PROVIDES ADEQUATE INTRINSIC REWARDS FOR STUDENTS	2.5	5.8	9.9	45.5	36.4
PROVIDES ADEQUATE EXTRINSIC REWARDS FOR STUDENTS	9.9	16.5	25.6	34.7	13.2
PROVIDES ADEQUATE INTRINSIC REWARDS FOR FACULTY	13.4	19.3	31.9	20.2	15.1
PROVIDES ADEQUATE EXTRINSIC REWARDS FOR FACULTY	25.8	25.0	34.2	13.3	1.7
SCHOOL PROVIDES ADEQUATE RECOGNITION FOR ADVISOR	33.1	23.1	21.5	18.2	4.1
JOURNALISM COLLEAGUES APPRECIATE EFFORTS OF ADVISOR	23.1	27.3	25.6	14.0	9.9
ADVERTISING COLLEAGUES APPRECIATE EFFORTS OF ADVISOR	20.5	17.1	28.2	18.8	5.4
EFFORTS WILL HELP FULFILL CAREER GOALS OF ADVISOR	21.5	16.5	33.1	19.8	9.1
ADVISOR BELIEVES NSAC MORE LIKE WHAT EDUCATION SHOULD BE	10.8	12.5	28.3	33.3	15.0
ADVISING EFFORTS WILL HELP HIS/HER TENURE/PROMOTION/MERIT	45.3	23.9	21.4	6.8	2.6
TIME SPENT ON ADVISING, EQUIVALENT	10.7	14.9	11.6	23.1	39.7

TABLE 3

MEAN	STD DEV	N	VARIABLE
4.64463	.71716	121	Valuable learning experience for students
4.11570	.97630	121	Teaches more about how advertising works than most classes
3.65289	1.10084	121	Winning places students in a position to receive good job offers
3.28333	1.01405	120	Winning places students in a position to receive exceptional job offers
4.07438	.95886	121	Provides adequate intrinsic rewards for students
3.24793	1.17814	121	Provides adequate extrinsic rewards for students
3.04202	1.24462	119	Provides adequate intrinsic rewards for advisors
2.40000	1.06432	120	Provides adequate extrinsic rewards for advisors
2.37190	1.23242	121	School gives adequate recognition for advisors
2.60331	1.26148	121	Journalism (or other) colleagues appreciate efforts of advisor
2.91453	1.34275	117	Ad colleagues appreciate efforts of advisor
2.78512	1.24637	121	Efforts will help fulfill career goals of advisor
3.29167	1.19097	120	Advisor believes NSAC more like what education should be
1.97436	1.08645	117	Advising efforts will help his/her tenure/promotion/merit
3.66116	1.40567	121	Time spent on advising equivalent to teaching 2 courses per semester

TABLE 4
Correlation matrix

Valuable education for students	1.00000								
Teaches students about advertising	.53529	1.00000							
Winning provides students with good job offers	.29634	.33232	1.00000						
Winning provides students with exceptional job offers	.33616	.36741	.80860	1.00000					
Provides intrinsic rewards for students	.46290	.45362	.21414	.21904	1.00000				
Provides extrinsic rewards for students	.16433	.19220	.11189	.17389	.39664	1.00000			
Provides intrinsic rewards for advisors	.33782	.30293	.17163	.09746	.47128	.39332	1.00000		
Provides extrinsic rewards for advisors	.22169	.13577	-.05606	.05594	.32764	.49042	.48254	1.00000	
School provides recognition for advisor efforts	.23563	.15786	-.05762	.01324	.25847	.25737	.32037	.54256	1.00000
Colleagues appreciate	.29423	.31500	-.02197	.03481	.26573	.22934	.39649	.44795	.67459
	1.00000								
Ad colleagues appreciate	.28572	.23148	-.05503	-.02214	.27550	.25050	.39943	.43180	.63729
	73724	1.00000							
Efforts help fulfill career goals	.30542	.32193	.21850	.17962	.39699	.18981	.41273	.30536	.46477
	.46475	.56921	1.00000						
NSAC what educ. should be	.32896	.42760	.27326	.25780	.34331	.19182	.36340	.19397	.18458
	.21439	.22475	.42949	1.00000					
Efforts help ten/promo/merit	.14090	.21446	-.03575	.09775	.06050	.12154	.14670	.30520	.42839
	.41366	.42801	.40890	.28645	1.00000				
Time spent equal 2 courses	.19368	.32635	.04722	-.00392	.01267	-.03942	-.06891	-.14292	-.05653
	.04575	.01545	.08652	.21200	.02822	1.00000			

TABLE 5
Correlation coefficients

Appreciation and career advancement for advisor	1.0000											
Winning the competition promotes student careers in advertising	.0465	1.0000										
Competition is time consuming but educates students about advertising	.2422**	.2453**	1.0000									
Title of advisor	.1425	-.1693	.0504	1.0000								
Number of times won district	.2567**	.0127	.0946	.1613	1.0000							
Years advising NSAC	.2028*	.0472	.1224	.1658	.5743**	1.0000						
Extrinsic rewards for students	.2759**	.1462	.1338	.0949	.0687	.0530	1.0000					
Good learning experience for students	.3282**	.3303**	.4383**	.0958	.1473	.1939*	.1643	1.0000				
Extrinsic rewards for advisors	.5402**	.0000	.0437	.1715	.0356	.0641	.4904**	.2217*	1.0000			
Intrinsic rewards for advisors	.4365**	.1426	.2172*	.0715	.1347	.1402	.3933**	.3378**	.4825**	1.0000		
Intrinsic rewards for students	.3254**	.2288*	.2975**	.0661	.1926*	.2037*	.3966**	.4629**	.3276**	.4713**	1.0000	
Age of advisor	.1277	-.0686	.0571	.1829	.1496	.1738	.1615	.1840*	.1908*	.1260	.2156*	1.0000
Gender of advisor	-.0953	.0863	.0656	-.2258*	-.0673	-.1360	-.2198*	.0091	-.2167*	-.0135	-.1222	-.2688**
	1.0000											
Number of times placed national	.1405	.0782	.1146	.1513	.7326**	.4534**	.0543	.1454	-.0418	.2309*	.1802*	.1943*
	-.0630	1.0000										
Years teaching	.1543	-.0866	-.0780	.1887*	.2654**	.4071**	.0941	.1548	.0612	.1597	.1320	.4015**
	-.0665	.2128*	1.0000									

* < .05

** < .01

BEST COPY AVAILABLE